

**ADVISORY COUNCIL ON  
AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES**

**Meeting Minutes**

**October 11, 2002**

Alaska Building - 13<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
618 Second Avenue  
Seattle, Washington 98104-2232

**ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**Present:** Marc Avni, Martha Becker, Patrick Carroll, Gabriel Cohen, Steve Colwell, Cleo F. Corcoran, Timmie Faghin, Lee A. Gaylor, John D. Holecek, John Kennedy, Mae L. Shields, Karen Sluiter, Larry Verhei, Suzanne B. Wiley, Lisa Yeager, Frederick H. Yee.

**Absent:** Randal E. Hayhurst, Will Parry, Peter Steinbrueck

**Excused:** Thelma Coney, Juanita Grant, Helen Spencer

**Guest:** Joanne Brekke

**STAFF:** Ozell Bledsoe, Margaret Casey, Rosemary Cunningham, Pamela Piering, Allison Ruff, Karen Winston and Doug Ricker.

**Minutes**

**Karen Sluiter, Chair**, convened the meeting at 12:00 p.m. Introductions were made of AC members and new staff. The minutes of the September 13, 2002 meeting were approved with correction of the spelling of Representative Kenney's name.

**Working Session**

**Pamela Piering, Director**, presented the background and overview of allocation strategies for 2003 and beyond, including an update on projected 2003 ADS discretionary revenue from various funding sources. She provided a "snapshot" of key areas targeted for possible cuts or increases that the Planning and Allocations Committee will be reviewing.

AC members divided into three breakout groups to discuss the criteria for making discretionary funding decisions, including 2003-04 Guidelines as approved by the Sponsors and Criteria for Funding Reductions and Increases that were presented at the public hearing held in August. The groups worked with scenarios for 2003, which included funding cuts, additional funding, and long-term planning in light of our current economic situation. An ADS staff person was assigned as a notetaker for each group.

AC members reconvened as a whole and reported on the ideas and recommendations generated in the three breakout groups. Summary reports of the three groups are attached to these minutes.

## **Business Meeting:**

### **Report from Nominating Committee**

On behalf of the Nominating Committee, Marc Avni affirmed the slate of candidates for officers for 2003 and opened nominations from the floor. No other nominations were received and it was moved, seconded, and approved that nominations be closed. The slate of candidates for officers for 2003 are: Suzanne Wiley, Chair; Will Parry, Vice Chair; John Kennedy, Secretary-Treasurer; and Timmie Faghan, Representative At Large. Election of officers will be at the annual Advisory Council meeting on November 8, 2002.

### **Report from Health Care Task Force**

Martha Becker reported that at the October 1, 2002 HCTF meeting Dr. David MacDonald gave a presentation on SimpleCare, a nonprofit program of the American Association of Patients and Providers. This program is an alternative to traditional health insurance. She stated that Dr. MacDonald has made great efforts in seeking alternative methods for healthcare in King County and around the country, but that his model seemed too simplistic to become the replacement for everyone to use to pay for all health care needs. Fred Yee agreed and stated that some of the ideas presented seemed to reflect the “cash & carry model” that ADS has been working on. The next HCTF meeting will be at 1:30 pm on November 5, 2002 and will focus on the Home Care Quality Authority.

### **Report from Outreach and Advocacy**

Cleo Corcoran reported that the committee has been working on guidelines for preparing news releases to the media. AC members agreed that more time was needed for discussion and that this may be a good topic for the AC retreat early next year. Gabe Cohen reported on the planning for the legislative forum that will be held December 10, 2002.

## **Other Reports**

### **Economic Opportunity Institute**

- Report on the institute was postponed due to shortness of time available.

### **King County METRO ASAC**

- John Holocek reported on the meeting, which focused on special needs transportation issues.

### **Proposed increase in kitchen permit fees**

- Lillian Tang, ADS staff, reported on the potential negative impact on ADS clients if the kitchen permit fees are increased. AC members agreed that it is appropriate for the AC to express concern about the negative impact.

### **Independent Transportation Network**

- Karen Sluiter and Margaret Casey reported briefly on a meeting they attended regarding ITN and ideas that may be useful for transportation planning locally and Margaret presented a video with background information about ITN and its founder, Kathy Freund.

### **Director's Report**

**Pamela Piering, Director**, gave a brief report and was pleased to announce that the Seattle City Council had approved the inclusion of the Amy Wong Client Fund as part of the city-approved City Combined Charities to which city employees can make donations. Pam again thanked ADS staff, and particularly Linda Wells and Bob Liston, for their hard work in making this become a reality. The Amy Wong Fund provides a source of flexible funding for special needs of ADS Case Management clients. The fund is named in honor of Amy Wong who was a dedicated and highly regarded ADS case manager and the wife of Fred Yee, a member of our Advisory Council. Amy died of cancer at age 49. As a reminder to all, anyone can make tax-deductible contributions to the Amy Wong Fund.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 2:10 PM.

**Next Meeting:** Annual Meeting on November 8, 2002 at New Holly. Further information and directions will be sent prior to the meeting date.

Suzanne Wiley, Secretary-Treasurer \_\_\_\_\_

## **Working Session regarding the Allocation Strategies for 2003 and Beyond**

---

**Group Scenarios:** Each group will be asked to address the following scenarios.

**Scenario #1** - How would we make additional cuts (\$50,000 to \$100,000) in 2003 to meet reduced revenues? Is the proposed criteria, developed in 2002, sufficient? What are other suggestions?

**Scenario #2** - How would additional funding be allocated in 2003? Is the current criteria adequate?

**Scenario #3** - Given the current climate of local cuts and larger national issues looming, such as Medicare/Medicaid prescription drugs, the down-turn of the economy, and the threat of war, etc. what would be our response? (Increase volunteerism? Increased advocacy? Fill in the funding gaps?)

---

### **Notes from Group 1, AC meeting of Oct. 11, 2002**

**General comments:** To consider ideas to add revenue, rather than concentrating on reduction strategies.

#### **Ideas on criteria for funding reduction.**

- Identify other entities to fund services: reduce funding for services that are the responsibilities of other entities.
- Minimize duplication of services/agencies—consolidate programs.
- Retain critical mass: not to cut so deep that a program is badly wounded and can't really function (better to eliminate it than to have it limp along).
- Increase agency-matching requirements.
- Identify/define core services and essential services.

In the discussion of core services, the state requires minimum service levels for access, in-home, and legal services. The group inquired about the Legal Services requirement. In the state plan to the federal funding agency, all Area Agencies on Aging have an 11% Legal Services requirement. Recently, the state indicated that as each local community considers its legal services needs, it might propose to the state a waiver for changing the minimum percentage requirement.

#### **Considerations in case of funding increases:**

- cost of living increases need to be sustained
- help those hurting the most

## Notes from Group 2, AC meeting of Oct. 11, 2002

### Question 1 Where they would cut...

The group favored cuts in these programs:

1. *Homesharing* – Pro: Not a core service. Con: Quasi-discretionary money, not much savings to be had.
2. *Health Promotion* – Con: The group noted the importance of prevention in health maintenance.
3. *Technology* – Pro: Seniors would feel least direct impact. Con: Technology allows programs to document numbers required to justify ADS programs.

The group also discussed *Information & Assistance, Client Specific, and Home Health Maintenance (Vashon)*, but decided against making cuts in these areas.

### Question 2 If we get extra funding...

The group asked which programs could absorb funding fastest. *Technology* and the *Client Specific Fund* were mentioned as perhaps the best options.

### Question 3 Dealing with severe cuts...

- More volunteers – but even volunteers aren't free
- The *SPICE* program is not a core service and could be phased out.
- Some services are already cut to the bone. It might be better to eliminate a few programs rather than cutting across the board.
- Lobby the state to lower the 11% a funding requirement for *Legal Services*.

## **Notes from Group 3, AC meeting of Oct. 11, 2002**

### **General Comments:**

- Need to look at the top issues
- Could use the phrases “need to have” vs. “would be nice to have” as tools for decision making. Safety vs. Security.
- What services serve as a safety net?

### **Possible Targets for Cuts:**

- Intergenerational Activity
- Legal Services
- General Senior Center funding (\$123,848)
- Technology Support
- Homesharing

Legal Services – What are we getting in terms of services for the money being spent?

Senior Centers – The cost of running the senior centers is likely much higher than the actual ADS discretionary cost. Spreading the cut across senior centers would not make the impact as significant. Many senior centers do their own fundraising, and although cutting a portion would be painful, it would not be devastating. The location of the center might make a difference in their ability to supplement with fundraising efforts.

Technology Support – One argument for cutting technology support is that it should be categorized as a business expense. Countering that argument is the fact that very few agencies have enough overhead for technology support. In addition, the reporting requirements for different programs influence the need for greater technology support.

Homesharing – how many people are being served through the Homesharing program?

### **Possible Solutions:**

Sliding Fees – ADS could look into charging for services on a sliding fee schedule. Certain case management programs (particularly in the private and non-profit sector) are starting to charge for their services.

Although the OAA does not allow means testing, ADS and the contract agencies could make a concerted effort to educate participants on the need for additional funding due to a tight budget. The suggested fee for congregate meals could be better explained. The general idea is to develop a mentality away from entitlement.

**Advisory Council Needs:**

- Brief description (written) of services, both in-house and those contracted out, including the agency, number of people served, contact person, etc.
- Pie chart for each service area by the fund source – what portion is federal, state, and local. Also, for each contract, how much of their overall funding for the program is provided by ADS?